

Appl. No.: 10/759,630
Reply to Final Office Action of: August 11, 2005

Remarks

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of an informality. The Examiner points out that the phrase "of the" is repeated in the last line. Accordingly, the repeated phrase has been deleted to address the Examiner's objection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11, 17-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narozny (U.S. Patent No. 4,067,637) in view of Sinclair (U.S. Patent No. 4,225,205). The Examiner contends that Narozny discloses the elements of claim 11 except for the two part plates of the ribbon being mutually connected by an integral flexible connecting piece. Instead, as the Examiner correctly points out, the two part plates of Narozny are latched to each other without an integral flexible connecting piece. The Examiner then relies upon Sinclair for a disclosure of the integral flexible connecting piece.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite that at least one of the part plates has contact openings passing through the part plate proximate the leading edge. This recitation in combination with the other claim elements is distinguishable from the teachings of both Narozny and Sinclair since neither reference teaches nor suggests contact openings passing through part plates. The Examiner has not recited any reasons nor justification for rejecting the claims that depend from claim 11 and especially claim 19 which requires that both part plates have contact openings. While the Examiner may rely upon the references cited, *arguendo*, to show contact openings, neither of the references teach nor suggest contact openings passing through part plates to facilitate electrical connection in the same way of the invention. Claim 19 has also been

Appl. No.: 10/759,630
Reply to Final Office Action of: August 11, 2005

amended to more clearly recite that the contact openings pass through the part plates. The rejection of claims 11, 17-20 and 23 is therefore respectfully overcome. Reconsideration, entry of the amendment and allowance of these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narozny and Sinclair as applied to claims 11, 17-20, and 23, and further in view of Strate (U.S. Patent No. 4,831,892). Since the rejection of claim 11 under the combination of Narozny and Sinclair has been overcome as discussed above, the addition of Strate does not teach nor suggest the required elements of amended claim 11 from which claims 21 and 22 depend. Therefore, the rejections of claims 21 and 22 is also respectfully overcome and reconsideration is requested.

Similarly, claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narozny and Sinclair as applied to claims 11, 17-20, and 23, and further in view of Ortega, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,830,012). For the same reasons recited above regarding claims 21 and 22, the rejection of claim 24 is also respectfully overcome since a combination of Narozny and Sinclair do not render amended claim 11 obvious. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Appl. No.: 10/759,630
Reply to Final Office Action of: August 11, 2005

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayments associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,



Salvatore Anastasi
Registration No. 39,090
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 610-722-3899
Facsimile: 610-889-3696

PTO Customer No.: 29450